



MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD (ERB)
Santa Monica Mountains
MEETING OF JULY 20, 2009
(Minutes approved on September 10, 2009)

PERSONS IN ATTENDANCE:

ERB MEMBERS

Rosi Dagit
Dr. Noël Davis (absent)
Ron Durbin
Suzanne Goode
Dr. Margot Griswold (absent)
Richard Ibarra (absent)
Dr. Travis Longcore
David Magney (absent)

REGIONAL PLANNING STAFF

Jeff Juarez (ERB Coordinator)
Dr. Shirley Imsand (County Biologist)
Jennifer Bendewish (DRP, temporary ERB member)
Richard Claghorn (DRP)

Project No. R2009-01059/RPPT2009-00703

Borna Drive, Malibu/APN: 4461-039-006

Don Schmitz	818-338-3636
Steve Reyes	818-338-3636

.....
AGENDA ITEMS & PAGINATION:

1. Minutes of February 23, 2009, p.2
2. Minutes of June 15, 2009, p.2
3. August, September meeting schedule, p.2

NEW BUSINESS:

4. **Project No. R2009-01059/RPPT2009-0073 (Borna Drive single-family residence, access road)**
Borna Drive, Malibu/APN: 4461-039-006, pp. 4-11

OTHER MATTERS

5. **Public comment** pursuant to Section 54954.3 of the Government Code.

NOTE: ERB MEETINGS ARE INFORMAL WORKING SESSIONS. MEMBERS ARE APPOINTED AS VOLUNTEERS TO SERVE IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY. MINUTES ARE PREPARED BY PLANNING STAFF PRIMARILY FROM NOTES. MEETINGS ARE ALSO RECORDED ON TAPE WHICH IS USED PRIMARILY AS A BACK-UP FOR STAFF. VISITORS ARE ADVISED TO TAKE PROPER NOTES AND/OR RECORD THE MEETING. NEW OR CLARIFIED INFORMATION PRESENTED IN BIOTA REVISIONS MAY RAISE NEW ISSUES AND REQUIRE FURTHER ANALYSIS. MINUTES ARE GENERALLY APPROVED AT THE FOLLOWING MEETING. DRAFT MINUTES MAY BE REQUESTED BUT ARE SUBJECT TO REVISION.

ERB MINUTES

July 20, 2009

1. **Minutes of February 23, 2009:** The ERB is concerned about how to adequately ensure that all of the information of the minutes is contained in one document. In the past the ERB has had problems with documents getting separated, and incomplete information being submitted to other agencies and misrepresenting the ERB's intent. The County Biologist should re-do the minutes as a strikethrough with corrections so that it is clear what changes were made, and then incorporate by reference whatever addendums or appendixes are added. After this is done, the ERB will review it. Alternatively, ERB recommends presenting the case to County Counsel for all documents to be together as one unit. Specifics of previous problems were described to present to Counsel.
2. **Minutes of June 15, 2009:** The minutes were approved with the minor amendment listed below on a motion by Ron Durbin and a second by Suzanne Goode.
 - Correct the date indicated in the document header
3. **August, September meeting schedule:** The ERB was asked by the ERB Coordinator if there were any requests to cancel the meeting dates for either August or September to accommodate any vacation plans or time-off. At the request of the ERB, availability and status of these meetings will be determined via email. No changes to the schedule were made during the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

4. **Borna Drive, Malibu (Single-family residence and access road improvements)**

Project No. R2009-01059
Plot Plan: RPPT2009-0073
APN: 4461-039-006
Location: Borna Drive, Malibu
Applicant: Don Schmitz, Schmitz & Associates, Inc.

Project: The project proposes the construction of a 9,878 square foot single-family residence with attached 952 sq.ft. garage, and 6,226 linear feet (1.18 miles) of road improvements. The residential component of the project entails construction of the residence and attached garage, totaling 10,830 sq.ft., swimming pool, driveway, Fire Department turnaround, landscaping, hardscaping, retaining walls, drainage devices,

and private septic system. Grading for the residence includes 5,050 cubic yards of cut and no fill. The proposed road construction includes improvements to a series of existing improved and unimproved roads (McReynolds Road, Mar Vista Ridge Road, and Borna Drive) approximately 15-25 feet wide for access to the subject property. The improvements include grading, paving, drainage devices, and retaining walls. Grading for the access road consists of 7,200 c.y. of cut and 8,600 c.y. of fill, with 3,650 c.y. of export. The combined grading total for the residence and road improvements is 12,250 c.y. of cut and 8,600 c.y. of fill. The proposed improved roads traverse and/or abut several properties between McReynolds Road and the subject property.

Resource: The proposed residential project site is located in the **Santa Monica Mountains Malibu Coastal Zone**, within the **Solstice Canyon Significant Watershed**. An **ESHA**-designated area and blueline stream (**Solstice Canyon**) is located less than 100 feet north and northeast of the subject property. The site includes *Calochortus plummerae*, a plant with CNPS List 1B.2 status, which means, "Rare, threatened, or fairly endangered in California." The plant is of special interest but with no special status of endangered or threatened. One property bordering the subject parcel on the east is federal land.

A second blueline stream (a **Solstice Canyon** tributary) is located within 100 feet south of proposed improvements to Borna Drive. A third blueline stream (**Escondido Canyon**) is adjacent to the intersection of McReynolds Road and Mar Vista Ridge Road, and is less than 200 feet from proposed road improvements to Mar Vista Ridge Road. Approximately 2,436 linear feet of proposed road improvements to Mar Vista Ridge Road, to the east of McReynolds Road, are located within a **Wildlife Migration Corridor**.

Request: **Review plans for the proposed single-family residence and road improvements. The ERB recommendations will be used as guidelines for the Director's Review and as part of any necessary environmental review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** Projects normally exempt from CEQA are subject to environmental review when in sensitive locations [PRC §15300.2(a)].

Notes on Applicant's Presentation:

- The applicant agreed to temporary ERB member Jennifer Bendewish (DRP) for the purpose of having a meeting quorum.
- The applicant pointed out that the property has an unconditional certificate of compliance from the County of Los Angeles.
- The legal and physical access to the subject property is off of McReynolds Road, which turns into Mar Vista Ridge Road. The property owners, including the applicant, maintain the roads in the area. Annual side mowing is part of this maintenance, even when there are no residences, as on Borna Drive.
- The reason only portions of the road are paved was financial, even though the property owners have a permit from the Coastal Commission to pave all the existing roads in the project area. The applicant had to pave (in 1995) the sections of the road that exceeded 10 percent slope. It is a condition of the Coastal Commission to pave all the roads.

- Applicant indicated that the Coastal Commission approved paving all of the roads that are being talked about, including Mar Vista Ridge Road all the way to the applicant's current property at 2700 Mar Vista Ridge Road.
- The applicant showed Coastal Development permit #4-94-224, for the McReynolds Road Homeowners. The property owners together submitted the application, which includes Borna Drive.
- The applicant noted that during the site visit with the County Biologist, Plummer's mariposa lily was identified on the site. The applicant indicated that the Plummer's mariposa lily would be flagged and maintained on the site even though they occur in the fuel modification zone.
- The Backbone Trail includes the mapped one that goes through the bottom of Solstice Canyon. In its original configuration the trail has one branch along Castro Peak Motorway, which has been subject to litigation and is now gated-off and closed. The litigation has been settled and published. The applicant states that the property is visible from the trail, but the applicant was not sure about the house's visibility from the trail. The property is not visible from the gates. The applicant acknowledged that further to the east there is another public trail, and that a visual analysis from there could be done.
- The applicant pointed out that locating the house in the existing flat pad on the southeastern portion of the property would create problems for fuel modification, because of the National Park Service land to the south and east. The applicant stated that he would rather deal with the property owner to the west than the NPS. This is what compelled the applicant to locate the development as far west on the site as possible. A fire wall (six-foot concrete block) is incorporated along the east side of the subject property, above the existing road, to reduce the fuel modification zone to 150 feet. The fire wall would not be visible from public trails.
- The applicant pointed out that there is an existing graded road, which is partly on the NPS property, but that the required fire turnaround does not exist.
- The applicant stated that the access road must be improved to fire department access standards.
- The applicant noted that the consultant biologist who prepared the Biological Resource Evaluation (dated December 3, 2008) did not think that the location of the project would hurt any wildlife migration areas or that there would be any important connectivity issues. The proposed development is within the 10,000 square-foot (pad) area calculation limitation, and it is located well away from the riparian corridor located to the north and east. The applicant stated that property owners want to develop consistent with the law, and the expectation is that the level of review will be based upon the law.
- The biological survey was done during that time (August) in an effort to move forward on the application, knowing that a supplemental survey may be required by the Coastal Commission and the County.
- In response to ERB questions, the applicant asked why the ERB believed the biota report incorrectly stated that the Plummer's mariposa lily was unlikely.
- The applicant asked the ERB for advice in doing a better job in the future on conducting biological evaluations.
- The applicant pointed out the surrounding development, including projects reviewed by the ERB, and noted that the proposed project is substantially in compliance with current standards and practice. The structure will be located close to the road and services. The project is minimizing impacts on the habitat as much as possible while remaining consistent with fuel modification standards. Site grading will follow stream protection and erosion policies, and grading will be within standards. The project will not exceed the 10,000 square-foot threshold.
- The applicant stated that only an oak tree survey was conducted because the survey showed that the project will be out of the protected zones of all jurisdictional oak trees. The applicant stated that an oak tree report will be provided per request of ERB.

- The applicant stated that development of the residential site is completely shown on the plans, but the improvements to the roads, including grading, are not completely shown. Road improvements have been approved on Mar Vista Ridge Road south to Borna Drive for a previous project. The applicant commented that eventually there will be an access road extension off Borna Drive for other parcels in the vicinity of the subject parcel.
- The applicant stated that the road would not be looping and would have only one intersection with Borna Drive, and that it would be one-way in and one-way out. This is because the last developable parcel is three or four parcels to the west, along the ridgeline. The road exists, and there are easements across those parcels.
- The access road includes several proposed turnarounds, and it will not loop around and connect. The junction area with Borna has been used as a Fire Department temporary staging area.
- The applicant stated his concern that the standard fuel modification zones might be inadequate in this location. That is the reason for the 100 feet of irrigated fuel modification zones of A and B. This concept has been approved by the Fire Department.
- A final, detailed landscape plan will be done and will follow recommended requirements by the Coastal Commission that is part of this review process. This includes a 5-year monitoring plan. The 12,000 sq.ft. of turf shown on the plans is probably a typo and should be 1,200 sq.ft.
- The applicant noted that an easement will be requested from the adjacent property owner for the planned stairs or the applicant will do a re-design of the structure. The applicant stated that the ERB might get its requested reduction of the structure's footprint.
- There will be a deed restriction of type 306-10 placed by the Coastal Commission on any additional development or structure beyond the proposed project. Such an addition would require a new permit.

ERB Meeting Date: July 20, 2009

ERB Evaluation: Consistent Consistent after Modifications
X Inconsistent No decision

ERB COMMENTS:

- The ERB asked if the Coastal Commission approved the paving of all the roads in the project vicinity. Does the road paving permit include Borna Drive?
- The ERB stated that mowing should only be needed as protection of fire fighters for roads with residences. Borna should not have needed mowing before construction of residences.
- The Backbone Trail has two different segments there, doesn't it? Is the project visible from the trail? It would be interesting to have a visual analysis from that portion of the Backbone Trail. It is the subject of litigation but it hasn't been settled. People can still hike to the gate. There is still a public trail from which this property is visible, and a visual analysis should be done from that trail.
- No brush clearance will be allowed on National Park Service land.
- The ERB inquired about the road and turnaround shown on the plans as a 40-foot wide easement on the east side of the subject property. Why is it shown?
- Would the fire wall be visible from public trails?
- The ERB pointed out that the applicant's fire wall does not reduce Zone C by 50 feet. The applicant would not get the 50 feet of fuel modification anyway (which would extend onto

- NPS land). The National Park Service will not do fuel modification for adjacent structures, and they will not permit a nearby resident to do fuel modification on NPS property.
- ERB states that the irrigated zone extended out to 100 feet instead of the standard 50 feet is a substantial impact to the biology of the area. ERB recommends having the irrigation available but using it only for fire safety.
 - The ERB commented that there is a huge connectivity issue because the applicant is placing an enormous structure with all of its associated disturbances right in the middle of an area that's currently wild in all directions around the project site. Putting something this intrusive and large is going to have an impact on natural resources. The ERB stated that wildlife movement will be disturbed. Further, the project will change a wide area because of the paving and widening of the road with its associated impacts.
 - The ERB stated that development is being inserted into a currently undeveloped area. Placing what is truly a big development in the middle of that area is, in fact, impeding wildlife movement that sustains biological resources and impacting the entire natural area. The environmental impacts of going to the furthest end of the actual planned development, securing approvals, and then infilling with residences all the way to the beginning of the road are not fully visible when considering each individual residence. Contending that there will be no disturbances on the basis of each individual project's footprint is erroneous. The ERB stated that it cannot do anything about this because of development policy constraints.
 - The ERB commented that the fact that there will be a development in this location is a significant impact. This is in spite of the project's compliance with the 10,000 sq.ft. limitation and in spite of compliance in how the project gets developed. The ERB stated that it is necessary to point out when there are regionally cumulative and significant adverse impacts from a project.
 - The ERB pointed out that the biological report states that a survey was conducted on August 19, 2008, on all three of the parcels shown on the map.* The report shows the potential occurrence of *Calochortus plummerae* (Plummer's mariposa lily) as "low potential ... No *Calochortus* observed during the site surveys." The ERB commented that biological surveys should be done at the right time of year in order to capture what's there and not there. Why was the survey done in August and not in spring, when it should have been done? Usually surveys are done in spring and fall to be complete.
 * Coordinator's note: Exhibit 4 of the report shows that these parcels include the subject parcel, the adjacent parcel to the west, and a yet to be created parcel. These last two parcels are shown as "not a part of this project and application."
 - The ERB explained that the August survey was well outside of the bloom period of late March to June, and that the conjecture of "unlikely" was incorrect and should not have been made based on a survey done in August.
 - For a species regarded as rare and sensitive, having its status go from "low potential" (as stated in the report) to actually observed (during a site visit with the County Biologist) indicates that the report is not accurate. There could be more sensitive species that have been missed entirely. Because of this inaccuracy, and failure to even acknowledge the possibility of inaccuracy, the ERB cannot trust the conclusions of the report. The ERB also knows that the distribution of the sensitive species on the property is unknown.
 - The report draws conclusions without the evidence to support them, nor the evidence of the effort needed to support them. The report fails to acknowledge any of its own limitations, such as stating the lack of a spring survey, which is indicated in the report to be the flowering period for the plant species.
 - The ERB also expressed concern with the conclusions about no impacts on the southern California rufous-crowned sparrow. There is no support for these conclusions. No discussion of the literature is provided by the consultant on the issue of effect of

fragmentation on the rufous-crowned sparrow, which is known to be extremely sensitive to fragmentation. The ratio of SCRC sparrows, (unfragmented habitat : fragmented habitat) is 50:1. The presence of this bird on-site suggests the site is very pristine habitat. This project is turning an unfragmented habitat into fragmented habitat. The act of the development in that location, regardless of where or how it's located on the site, takes away the habitat of a sensitive bird. The conclusion that there would be no impact on the southern California rufous-crowned sparrow has no basis, nor is there any reference to the science literature that exists for the rufous-crowned sparrow. The ERB states this project will have an impact on this bird; the project cannot avoid impacts.

- The ERB suggested that references in biological reports should include specific peer-reviewed literature that supports conclusions. Standard general references and no specific references for species encountered are an indication of insufficient research for the report.
- The ERB asked for the protected oak tree report noted on page 7 of the biological report. The ERB commented that it would be helpful to have an oak tree report that accurately shows the location, size and shape of the existing oaks, and their distances from the proposed improvements, particularly oak trees 10, 11, and 12 (as shown on the survey). These may have impact from the entry road.
- The ERB pointed out that the proposed paved road will extend a distance of over one mile into an area that is currently undeveloped. From an environmental impact point of view, that is a huge growth inducement because it extends from Latigo Canyon Road to the edge of the NPS property. With paving of this road, every parcel along this route can be infilled with a residence. At the terminus, development could have a paved road looping to the ridgeline to develop two more parcels shown on Exhibit 4 of the biological report.
- The ERB made the general point that the County is obliged to do something about development located remote from services. Such development is expensive to protect and dangerous to protect. It puts the lives of firefighters and other safety workers at risk to protect properties that expect to be protected. There is no way to develop these projects and not have impacts. The impacts are significant, they're adverse, and they're cumulative. Over the course of the last 10 years of the ERB review of such projects, they continue to be adverse, significant, and cumulative, and the County has not moved towards doing anything about such development.
- The ERB commented that it did appreciate that the garage is attached to the house, and that there is an attempt to notch the house into the hill. However, the project is large, and the impacts occurring in relation to this would be less if the structure were smaller.
- The project increases the amount of impervious surface. Plans should incorporate a cistern to retain runoff water for fire-fighting and landscaping purposes. Capture should be according to Regional Water Quality Control Board standards.
- The ERB commented on the issue of night lighting. This large, lighted structure with many windows impacts wildlife movement in this area. The ERB mentioned the example of a study in Orange County on cougar movement, in which it was demonstrated that cougars actively avoid lighted areas, even those that are abandoned.
- The proposed outdoor lighting should be changed to incorporate lighting measured in lumens and not wattage (40 watts fluorescent would be about 2,000 lumens, whereas 40 watts incandescent might be only 500 lumens). What is desired is minimal lumens for least impact to wildlife. Lighting should be shielded. Large structures like this in an undeveloped area should also shield interior lighting at night to reduce impacts to aesthetics, visibility, and wildlife.
- The ERB noted that all of these projects go forward with the recommendation for a condition that cats are kept indoors to protect wildlife (birds, lizards, etc.) Outside cats will

- be subject to predation at night, but they are significant predators on birds, lizards, and small mammals by day. There is also a condition that dogs are kept on a leash outside of Zone B of fuel modification. This condition is based on evidence of adverse effects, such as reduced native bird diversity, even from walking dogs on trails.
- All development impacts add to erode away the biological diversity that is supported in these mountains.
 - Cumulative impacts that are being proposed here from paving of the road and this particular structure are added to impacts of the other projects that are going to follow. That the applicant paid to have a biological report done for multiple parcels is evidence that the project needs to be examined with respect to its regional impact. This introduces development into an area that is now natural, is on the ridge above Solstice Canyon (a SERA and ESHA), and is in a high fire danger area.
 - Because this particular area is relatively pristine, and because construction equipment is capable of transferring invasive species' seeds from one area to another, the ERB recommends that the construction vehicles and grading equipment, for the road as well as the proposed residence, be thoroughly pressure washed before being brought onto the site.
 - ERB asked if the access road in the project vicinity could eventually result in four developed lots (including the present project).
 - Would there be a way for firefighters to get in and out in two different ways, versus just the one?
 - The ERB recommends a combined 50-foot wide zone A and B of irrigated fuel modification, and 150 feet for thinning. Fuel modification is yet another biological impact.
 - Correct the plans showing 12,000 square feet of turf to comply with LID requirements (less than 5000 sq.ft. of turf).
 - Provide a more realistic and detailed landscape plan; this one is too simplified. Lack of details in landscape plans ends up with installation being very different from what the plans show. Once the applicant reaches the stage for detailed installation plans, the fuel modification plan will need to be re-submitted.
 - The stairs on the west side of the house extend into the adjacent property. This is a planning issue. The ERB suggests reducing the structure to make an easement unnecessary.
 - The window for the spring biological survey is April – May, depending on the rainy season. Earlier rains allow plants to come up earlier, and in a season with early rains, the survey can be done earlier. But the typical window is from the end of March to the end of May. The survey should include a nesting survey and a bird count, in addition to track and scat examination for both the road and the residential site. The survey should follow proper protocols for any possible sensitive species.
 - The ERB states that the project is inconsistent due to the length of the road, the distance from public services, and due to the basic fact that there is no way there can be structures placed into a natural area without having adverse impacts. Adverse environmental impacts come from this kind of remote development, and therefore, this project is not consistent with the (Malibu) Local Coastal Plan.
 - The ERB recommends an initial study be done that includes an analysis of growth inducement and cumulative impacts. The initial study must look at this project in a regionally comprehensive way. Focusing on the road and this one house in isolation will not really provide the big picture of actual impacts from the project.

ERB RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. An initial study shall be conducted for this project, which includes the proposed residential development site and the proposed paved access road. The initial study shall include an analysis of growth inducement and cumulative impacts as related to this project.
2. A biological survey shall be conducted in spring and shall include a sensitive plant and wildlife survey, a nesting survey, bird count, and wildlife sign (tracks and scat) study. The survey shall cover the area of the proposed road improvements and the residential development site.
3. The biological report shall be revised to include a field survey and literature survey supporting the conclusions in the report.
4. An oak tree report in accordance with Title 22, Chapter 22.56, Part 16, shall be required for this project and shall consider all oak trees within 200 feet of the project.
5. An analysis of the potential visual and aesthetic impacts to adjacent public trails shall be conducted for this project.
6. A cistern shall be incorporated into the project to retain that which is required by the Regional Water Control Board.
7. A detailed landscape plan in compliance with the County's Green Building Program ordinances shall be submitted.
8. Household cats should be kept indoors during day and night hours, and dogs should be leashed beyond Zone B of fuel modification.
9. The residential development shall be in earth tones to camouflage the structure, coordinating with the color of soil, rocks, and native vegetation of the site. Use of native vegetation in landscaping will help screen the structure.
10. Internal lighting shall be shielded during the night to reduce impacts to the area's aesthetics, visibility, and wildlife.
11. The proposed outdoor lighting shall be revised to incorporate lighting measured in lumens and not wattage. Exterior night lighting shall be minimized using low intensity (lights not exceeding 800 lumens), low stature fixtures (2.5-3 ft.). Lights shall be directed downwards with good shielding against projection into the nighttime sky, surrounding properties, and undeveloped areas. If DPW does not require public lighting, then none shall be used. Security lighting, if used, shall be on an infrared detector or use motion detectors.
12. Perimeter fencing shall not be allowed; security fencing, as around a pool, is permitted.
13. The fuel modification plan shall provide zone dimensions and follow these standards:

Zone A: 20 feet wide; irrigated; non-invasive ground covers

Zone B: 30 feet wide beyond Zone A; irrigated; contains non-invasive ground covers, native plants, deep-rooted perennials, some well-spaced shrubs and trees

Zone C: Beyond Zones A and B (to 200 ft. from the structure or to property line, whichever is less), mosaic of thinned, clumped, native vegetation, pruned on a staggered 2-3 year schedule, with clumps adjacent to one another in alternate pruning times.

In preparing Zone C for fuel modification:

1. Retain as many non-sprouting species as possible. (They usually have a single trunk.) Do not cut off the trunk in pruning, as this kills the plant.
2. Choose multiple-trunked, resprouting species for removal over non-sprouters. The remaining multi-trunked remaining shrubs should be pruned in a staggered, clumped pattern on an alternating schedule, allowing 2-3 years between prunings for any one clump. Resprouting species can be pruned to near ground level.

For guidance, refer to:

a) The CNPS (California Native Plant Society) website at <http://www.cnps.org/>

b) The Los Angeles County Fire Department at:

<http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/Forestry/BrushManagementPlantIDGuide.asp>

14. All construction vehicles and grading equipment shall be thoroughly pressure washed before being brought onto the project site, which includes the access road and residential development site. The pressurized washing shall follow these instructions:
 - Pressurized washing shall be done for all vehicles (1) before coming to the site, (2) when moving between site areas with many invasives to more natural sites, (3) at the end of each day of grading in areas with invasive plants, and (4) before moving the vehicle or equipment to another site. Vehicle operators shall fill out a log book kept in a waterproof container at each washing or entry to site that can be checked by the biologist in charge of biological mitigation.
 - When vehicles come to the site from other areas, they must be pressure washed. For vehicles that can enter a standard car wash, choose a car wash with wheel well cleansing and undercarriage cleansing. When grading and other equipment that remains on-site is first brought to site, wash at corporation yard and again at entry of project site washing facility.
 - An on-site pressurized washing facility must be constructed. For a project this size, there shall be multiple on-site pressurized washing facilities. Self-contained pressurized washing equipment can be purchased or rented. A standard washing pit includes (1) heavy timbers at grade level, (2) underlain by a bed of 2-3" sized aggregate, (3) underlain by a felt-like geotech cloth. The soil of the pit shall be retained on-site for back-fill. The washed seeds and plant parts wash through the timbers and gravel onto the geotech cloth. At the end of construction, the pit shall be disassembled and back-filled, and the geotech cloth carefully removed with all contents and taken to a disposal site and buried deeply so that the invasive plant parts and propagules will not spread to other areas.

Staff Recommendation:

☐ Consistent
☒ Inconsistent

☐ Consistent after Modifications
☐ No decision

Staff Recommendations:

- The County Biologist requested a spring (biological) survey that includes the road and residence parcel. The survey should look for wildlife, wildlife sign (tracks and scat), and special interest plants on the residence parcel, along the roadway, and at all locations intended for retaining walls, velocity dissipators, and other construction. Adjust the road plan to avoid impacts on sensitive biological resources. Mitigate for any impacts that cannot be avoided.
- The ERB Coordinator pointed out that it is likely that an initial study will be conducted for this project due to the potential significant impacts mentioned by the ERB. Also, a CUP may be required for this project, but this has not been decided. The project planner will follow-up with the applicant as to whether a CUP or Director's Review will be required.